UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,811	12/21/2001	Edgar Circenis	10016874-1	4048

7590 03/24/2005	EXAMINER
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY	GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/023,811	CIRCENIS, EDGAR
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shewaye Gelagay	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-32 have been examined.

Specification

2.   The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Gullotta et al. (hereinafter Gullotta) United States Publication Number 2002/0147801.

As per claim 27:

        Gullotta teaches a method for regulating execution of a computer operation by a

computer operator comprising:

        providing a programming interface for a customer to customize an authorization

routine; (Page 6, paragraph 65)

receiving a request to execute a computer operation from a computer operator;
(Page 6, paragraph 65)

determining if authorization is required for executing the computer operation;
(Page 7, paragraph 78)

seeking authorization from an authorizing party with the authorization routine if
authorization is required; (Page 7, paragraph 78)

executing the computer operation if authorization is granted; (Page 8, paragraph
91) and

terminating the computer operation if authorization is denied. (Page 8,
paragraph 91)

As per claim 28

Gullota teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota
further discloses a method comprising: determining if notification is required for
executing the computer operation and if notification is required, providing a notification
to the party to be notified, so that the party to be notified will know that the computer
operation was executed. (Page 7, paragraph 78)

As per claim 29:

Gullota teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota
further discloses a method wherein prior to executing the computer operation,
authorization is sought from the same party as the party being notified, so that the
authorizing party is the party being notified. (Page 7, paragraph 78)

As per claim 30:

Gullota teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota

further discloses a method wherein seeking authorization further comprises asking the

computer operator to enter a key and comparing the entered key with a key required by

the authorizing party. (Page 6, paragraph 73; ...simple password authentication

techniques or certificate authentication)

As per claim 31:

Gullota teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota

further discloses a method comprising providing a toolkit for the customer to customize

the authorization routine. (Page 9, paragraph 111)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-20, 23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in

view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number

2002/0016915.

As per claim 1:

Weschler teaches a method for regulating execution of a computer operation, comprising:

reading one or more parameters specified with the computer operation; (Col. 4, lines 32-33)

determining if the computer operation requires a plug-in and if not, executing the computer operation; (Col. 4, lines 22-26; Col. 8, lines 5-7)

if the computer operation requires at least one plug-in, filtering any required plug-in parameters from the one or more parameters specified with the computer operation; (Col. 8, lines 7-9)

determining whether all required plug-in parameters for the at least one plug-in have been specified; (Col. 8, lines 11-14)

Weschler does not explicitly disclose terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; and executing the computer operation if the at least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer operation.

Kumazawa in analogous art, however, discloses

terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required plug-in parameters have been specified; (Page 3, paragraph 41) and

executing the computer operation if the at least one plug-in terminates with

success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates execution of the computer operation.

(Page 3, paragraph 42 and Page 4, paragraph 43)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler to

include terminating the at least one plug-in with failure if not all the required plug-in

parameters have been specified; executing the at least one plug-in if all the required

plug-in parameters have been specified; and executing the computer operation if the at

least one plug-in terminates with success, wherein the at least one plug-in regulates

execution of the computer operation. This modification would have been obvious

because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so,

as suggested by, Kumazawa (Page 1, paragraph 13) in order to allow retrieving content

from server only if the authentication process has confirmed the authenticity. This way,

the plug-in parameters are checked against the stored data thereby allowing executing

or terminating the plug-in.

As per claim 2:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In

addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein at least one plug-in requires at

least one plug-in parameter. (Col. 4, lines 30-32)

As per claim 3:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In

addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method comprising passing an error message

to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. (Page 3, paragraph 41; ...the processing unit causes the display unit to display a warning message ...)

As per claim 6:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein the at least one plug-in further comprises an authorization plug-in and executing the at least one plug-in further comprises attempting to obtain authorization for executing the computer operation. (Col. 8, lines 21-24)

As per claim 7:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method comprising terminating the authorization plug-in with failure if authorization was not successfully obtained, thereby terminating the computer operation. (Page 3, paragraph 41; ...the processing unit causes the display unit to display a warning message ...the processing unit ends the execution of the authentication plug-in)

As per claim 8:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a method wherein obtaining authorization further includes checking to see whether a value of at least one required plug-in parameter matches the value of at least one authorization parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 10:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein executing at least one plug-in further comprises executing a notification plug-in. (Col. 13, line 38)

As per claim 11:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method comprising determining whether all of the plug-in parameters required by the notification plug-in are specified before the computer operation and executing the notification plug-in after execution of the computer operation, whereby the computer operation is not executed if the notification plug-in terminates with failure after determining whether all of the plug-in parameters are specified. (Col. 14, lines 1-14)

As per claim 12:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a method wherein executing the notification plug-in further comprises notifying a party designated for notification. (Col. 14, lines 7-11)

As per claim 13:

Weschler teaches a computer operation for executing a system function on a computer further comprising:

a means for receiving at least one specified computer operation parameter; (Col. 4, lines 22-33; Col. 8, lines 5-9) and

Weschler does not explicitly disclose at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success.

Kumazawa in analogous art, however, discloses at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success. (Page 3, paragraphs 41 and 42 ; Page 4, paragraph 43)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler to include at least one plug-in that performs a regulatory function and that terminates with either success or failure, wherein the computer operation will execute only if the at least one plug-in terminates with success. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kumazawa (Page 1, paragraph 13) in order to allow retrieving content from server only if the authentication process has confirmed the authenticity of the user. This way, the plug-in parameters are checked against the stored data thereby allowing executing or terminating the plug-in.

As per claim 14:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the computer operation determines which of the specified computer operator parameters is a plug-in parameter and passes all specified plug-in parameters to the at least one plug-in. (Col.

4, lines 30-32)

As per claim 15:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in requires at least one required plug-in parameter. (Col. 8, lines 5-6)

As per claim 16:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in determines whether any required plug-in parameters are among the specified plug-in parameters. (Col. 14, lines 1-4)

As per claim 17:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in has a check mode in which the plug-in is executed to only check for the at least one required plug-in parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 18:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in has an execute mode in which the execute mode causes the plug-in to perform the regulatory function of the plug-in. (Col. 8, lines 15-20)

As per claim 19:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the computer operation passes a mode flag to the at least one plug-in indicating whether to check for the at least one required plug-in parameter. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 20:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-in generates at least one error message to be returned to the computer operation indicating that at least one required plug-in parameter was not specified. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 23:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein at least one plug-in is an authorization plug-in. (Col. 8, lines 21-24)

As per claim 25:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Kumazawa further discloses a computer operation where the authorization plug-in determines if authorization is granted by querying an authorization server to see if the computer is authorized to perform the computer operation. (Page 3, paragraph 41)

As per claim 26:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Weschler further discloses a computer operation wherein at least one plug-in

is a notification plug-in and has means for notifying a party that the computer operation

has been executed. (Col. 13, line 38)

7.   Claims 4-5 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et

al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and

further in view of Kobayashi et al. (hereinafter Kobayashi) United States Letter Patent

Number 6,694,312.

As per claim 4:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both

references do not explicitly disclose a method further comprising passing a data

structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in parameters

have not been specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a method comprising passing a

data structure to the computer operation indicating which of the required plug-in

parameters have not been specified. (Col. 6, lines 56-58)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler and

Kumazawa to include passing a data structure to the computer operation indicating

which of the required plug-in parameters have not been specified. This modification

would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kobayashi (Col. 6, lines 35-38) in order to

permit the user to directly specify to control the execution of external functions.

As per claim 5:

Weschler, Kumazawa and Kobayashi teach all the subject matter as discussed

above. In addition, Kobayashi further discloses a method comprising prompting a user

of the computer operation for the required plug-in parameters that had not been

specified based on the data structure. (Col. 6, lines 48-53)

As per claim 21:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both

references do not explicitly disclose a computer operation wherein the at least one plug-

in passes a data structure to the computer operation, whereby the data structure

contains the plug-in parameters that were not specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation wherein the

at least one plug-in passes a data structure to the computer operation, whereby the

data structure contains the plug-in parameters that were not specified. (Col. 6, lines 56-

58)

The rationale for combining the above references is the same as claim 4 above.

As per claim 22:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both

references do not explicitly disclose a computer operation wherein the computer

operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not

specified.

Kobayashi in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation a computer operation wherein the computer operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not specified. (Col. 6, lines 48-53)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer operation disclosed by Weschler and Kumazawa to include a computer operation wherein the computer operation prompts a user to enter at least one required parameter that was not specified. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Kobayashi (Col. 6, lines 35-38) in order to permit the user to directly specify to control the execution of external functions.

8.   Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler United States Letter Patent Number 6,842,903 in view of Kumazawa et al. (hereinafter Kumazawa) United States Publication Number 2002/0016915 and further in view of Edelman United States Letter Patent Number 6,857,067.

As per claim 9:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a method wherein the at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool.

Edelman in analogous art, however, disclose a method wherein the at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool. (Col. 8, lines 13-14; Col. 18, lines 64-67)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Weschler and Kumazawa to include at least one authorization parameter is generated using a license key generating tool. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Edelman (Col. 3, lines 62-63) in order to prevent unauthorized access. This way, the license data is verified before allowing the user to execute a plug-in.

As per claim 24:

Weschler and Kumazawa teach all the subject matter as discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose a computer operation where the authorization plug-in links to a license key generation tool controlled by an authorizing party so that the authorization plug-in grants authorization only if the system application is executed with a parameter specifying a license key generated by that tool.

Edelman in analogous art, however, disclose a computer operation where the authorization plug-in links to a license key generation tool controlled by an authorizing party so that the authorization plug-in grants authorization only if the system application is executed with a parameter specifying a license key generated by that tool. (Col. 8, lines 13-14; Col. 18, lines 64-67)

The rationale for combining the above references is the same as claim 9 above.

9.   Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullotta et al. (hereinafter Gullotta) United States Publication Number 2002/0147801 in view of Grey et al. (hereinafter Grey) United States Publication Number 2002/0174023.

As per claim 32:

Gullota teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Gullota further disclose a method comprising determining if notification is required and if notification is required, checking to see if a party to be notified has been specified. (Page 7, paragraph 78)

Gullota does not explicitly disclose wherein failing to specify a party to be notified will cause the computer operation to terminate.

Grey in analogues art, however, discloses a method wherein providing data indicative of an authorization and performing authorization process to proceed after the notification is performed. (Page 6, paragraphs 49 and 50) By performing the notification before the authorization process, the vendor will be able to terminate the computer operation if unable to notify the proper authority.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Gullota to include failing to specify a party to be notified will cause the computer operation to terminate. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so as suggested by, Grey (Abstract) in order to have a system for conducting or facilitating a transaction or request involving a product. This way, proper authority is notified every time an authorization is requested to add additional service by an employee or an administrator.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-

4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay
Examiner
Art Unit 2133

03/18/05